

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action dated August 29, 2008 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10, 12, 13, 15-17, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application 2002/0059288 to Yagi, *et al.* (hereinafter Yagi) in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2008/0098353 to Hambleton, *et al.* (hereinafter Hambleton). Claims 4 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yagi in view of Hambleton, and further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2005/0251748 to Gusmorino, *et al.* (hereinafter Gusmorino). Claims 7, 14, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yagi in view of Hambleton, and further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0056903 to Sakai (hereinafter Sakai).

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants have slightly modified the language of Claim 1. Applicants have cancelled Claims 8-21. However, Applicants are not conceding that the remaining claims as originally formulated or the cancelled claims fail to present patentable subject matter. The amendments and cancellations are solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution. Accordingly, neither the amendments nor cancellations should be interpreted as the surrender of any subject matter, and Applicants expressly reserve the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

As discussed herein, the claim amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the claim amendments.

Aspects of Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by amended Claim 1, is a method of arranging grammar files in a presentation list.

The method can include receiving a request to visually display in a graphical user interface the grammar files in the presentation list; and distinguishing between a first subset of files that contain user-defined grammars, each defining a user-defined grammar file, and a second subset of files that contain built-in grammars, each defining a built-in grammar file. A user-defined grammar file was written by a user of a call-flow application and a built-in grammar file was available when the call-flow application was installed.

The method also can include sorting the grammar files based on a first criterion that always assigns the first subset of files priority over the second subset of files; sorting the grammar files within the first subset of files and the grammar files within the second subset of files according to a second criterion; simultaneously displaying the first subset of files and the second subset of files within the presentation list such that the user-defined grammar files in the first subset of files are presented ahead of the built-in grammar files in the second subset of files; and partitioning the first subset of files and the second subset of files by a visual aid.

See, e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0016] to [0019].

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

Yagi discloses a file handling device designed to improve the efficiency of file selection in a GUI environment. Fig. 6 of Yagi shows a screen displayed by the file menu control section. Clicking "File" on the menu bar 41 of an application displays a file menu 51. In this case, the file menu 51 additionally displays a list 52 of recently accessed folders, a list 53 of folders pre-specified by the settings, and a list 54 of files pre-specified by the settings. See paragraph [0076]. Figs. 9(A) and 9(B) illustrate the operation performed when the "Browse" button is pressed, wherein Fig. 9(A) shows a

screen displayed by the file selection screen control section and Fig. 9(B) shows a screen displayed by the folder tree screen control section. As shown in Fig. 9(A), a file selection screen 81 displayed when the item "Open" is selected in the file menu includes a "Browse" button 82, in addition to the "Location of file:" field showing a current folder and the list box showing a list of files contained in the folder. When the "Browse" button 82 is pressed, the folder tree item creating section 28 is started. The folder tree item creating section 28 creates folder tree items in accordance with the display conditions set in the display item setting screen 44 of the setting screen 43, and the folder tree screen control section 29 displays a folder tree screen 83 as shown in Fig. 9(B). The folder tree screen 83 displays, in addition to ordinary folder tree information, a list 84 of recently accessed files, a list 85 of files pre-specified by the settings, a list 86 of recently accessed folders, and a list 87 of folders pre-specified by the settings. See paragraph [0090].

It was asserted in the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action that:

Yagi teaches two types of grammar files: recently accessed files and pre-specified files. Recently accessed files are those that a user has accessed recently, and thus may be considered user-defined grammar files. According to figures 4 and 10, the pre-specified files are application files, such as the file "MyApplication.exe" shown in Figure 11; thus pre-specified files represent program files, which may be considered built-in files.

However, first, it is noted that according to Claim 1 of the instant application, user-defined grammar files are grammar files written by a user of a call-flow application and built-in grammar files are grammar files that were available when the call-flow application was installed. Recently accessed files are the files that a user has accessed recently, but are not necessarily written by the user and thus cannot be compared with user-defined grammar files. The pre-specified files are the files that are set by a user using the setting screen as shown in Fig. 4(B) of Yagi. They are selected by the user and not built-in grammar files in the sense of the present invention. Second, it is noted that the recently accessed files and pre-specified files as described in Yagi are not grammar files for callflow development in the sense of the present invention. Third, it is noted that

the built-in grammar files according to the present invention are grammar files, not application files, existed when the call-flow application was installed.

It is also noted that in the present invention the user-defined grammar files are always given priority over the built-in grammar files. In contrast, in Yagi the files can be moved up and down in order (see Fig. 4(B)) and thus the recently accessed files are not necessarily always given priority over the pre-specified files.

It was stated in the last paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action that Yagi does not teach a call flow development graphical user interface, wherein each user-defined grammar file is written by a user of a call-flow application and each built-in grammar file was available when the call-flow application was installed; or sorting the grammar files within the subset of files according to a second criterion. However, it was asserted on page 4 of the Office Action that:

Hambleton teaches a system and method to geographically facilitate speech enabled user interfaces (see abstract), in which he teaches a call flow development graphical user interface (Figures 5-7, paragraph 12), wherein each user-defined grammar file is written by a user of a call-flow application (Customer Grammar in Figure 5, paragraph 47) and each built-in grammar file was available when the call-flow application was installed (Built-in Grammar in Figure 5, paragraph 47); and sorting the grammar files within the subset of files according to a second criterion (Figure 5, grammars are listed in alphabetical order).

Fig. 5 of Hambleton shows form 50 which deals with single fields and allows a user to indicate an initial prompt, such as "Say your account number," 51. The variable 52 is identified that will hold the recognition results. Field 53 allows the user to pick a grammar that is going to be active for the recognition instance defined by the form, or, if desired, the user can write his/her own grammar(s). There is a list on the form to support customizations and there can be as many grammars active as desired for this recognition instance. In the example, "number" grammar 503 is selected. See paragraph [0047].

In Hambleton the user can pick a grammar or write his/her own grammar(s). However, it is noted that in Hambleton the user-defined grammar(s) are written by the

user using the form 50 during the call flow development and do not exist when a visually display request for a presentation list is received. In contrast, in the present invention the user-defined grammars already exist when the display of the presentation list is requested and the present invention concerns always giving the user-defined grammars priority in the presentation list so that a callflow designer will be able to select grammar files faster and with better accuracy, not writing user-defined grammar during the call-flow development. Hambleton does not concern at all how the grammar files are presented.

Accordingly, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claim 1, as amended. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 defines over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **October 9, 2008**

/Gregory A. Nelson/

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577

Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Customer No. 40987

Post Office Box 3188

West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

Telephone: (561) 653-500